



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/486,483	03/23/2001	Kunio Sekiya	24555-001	6972

26691 7590 03/13/2006

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
ATTN: KATHLEEN W. GEIGER, ESQ.
P.O. BOX 951
WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0951

EXAMINER

HALPERN, MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1731

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/486,483

Applicant(s)

SEKIYA, KUNIO

Examiner

Mark Halpern

Art Unit

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/05.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission of IDS filed on 7/29/2005, has been entered.
- 2) Claims 2-5, 7, are under consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 3) Claims 2-5, 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaoru Kamogawa (JP-4-130190) in view of Donnelly (3,014,832).

Claim 2: Kaoru discloses a method of cleaning a surface of a papermaking rotating dryer drum wherein a release agent, an emulsified silicone oil solution, is applied to the surface of the drum by direct spraying onto the surface. The oil first forms a film on the surface of the drum and then is absorbed by fibers of a paper strip, which

Art Unit: 1731

rides on the drum. Kaoru, in Example 3, discloses continuous spraying at a rate of 2.0 l/min. onto a surface of a Yankee drum dryer, the dryer having a width of 3 meters, without staining the paper strip by the release of the oil (Kaoru, translation, pages 2-5). Kaoru fails to disclose the drying cylinder linear rotation speed, data that would permit to calculate the spray rate in units claimed. Donnelly discloses a process wherein a dryer surface is kept clean by the release spraying of silicone containing emulsified oil (col. 3, lines 15-20, col. 5, lines 1-22) onto the surface of the drum (Donnelly, col. 7, line 50 to col. 8, line 30, and Figure 2). Donnelly discloses drying cylinder drum rotation of up to 3000 feet per minute (Donnelly, col. 6, lines 55-60). Utilizing the Donnelly dryer rotation, the Kaoru method of cleaning calculates a spray rate of about 0.72 mg/m² per minute, which is within the claimed range. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Kaoru and Donnelly, because such a combination would improve the control of adhesion of the web to the dryer surface thus improve the quality of the Kaoru product as disclosed by Donnelly (col. 2, lines 50-68).

Claim 3: Kaoru discloses a surfactant added to the silicone oil (Pg. 1, claim 1).

Claims 4-5: water addition is disclosed by Donnelly (col. 4, lines 31-35). It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to dilute the oil with heated water, since the cylinder drum of Donnelly operates at elevated temperatures (Examples 1, 2).

Art Unit: 1731

Claim 7: see above described under claim 2, since the drum of a dryer is also a roll. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, that the silicone oil be replenished upon depletion.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4) Claims 2-5, 7, are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,858,113. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the present application and the patent disclose a method for preventing contamination of a surface of a dryer drum used in a papermaking machine

Art Unit: 1731

that includes the treatment of the rotating drum surface while facing a paper strip, with a surfactant containing oil at the rate of spray application that is within the range claimed.

5) Claims 2-5, 7, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of copending Application No. 09/806,020. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the present application and the patent disclose a method for preventing contamination of a surface of a dryer drum used in a papermaking machine that includes the treatment of the rotating drum surface while facing a paper strip, with a surfactant containing oil at the rate of spray application that is within the range claimed.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

6) The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Taichi Kuroda et al. (JP 7-292382) teaches of a contamination adhesion prevention agent for use in a papermaking drying process by applying a silicone containing oil to a rotating drum or other parts.

7) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone number is 571-272-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

Art Unit: 1731

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Halpern", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark Halpern
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1731